

MA TRANSPORTATION AD-HOC SUBCOMMITTEE
Issues and Proposed Solutions
Minutes/Recommendations from September 3, 2003 Meeting

Members Present via Conference Call:

Bob Macaux, Florence County
Deb Rathermel, Fond du Lac
Liz Green, Dane County
Barb Spaude, Outagamie
Debbie Blankenship, Winnebago (for Joyce Decker)
Joanne Simpson, DHFS
Eileen McRae, DHFS
Bernadette Connolly, DHFS

Members Absent

Sue Torum, Jefferson County
Tammy Pinno, Fond du Lac

1. The Workgroup continued discussing the items in the attached table. The first 3 items were reviewed (they were discussed at the last meeting). The remaining items were discussed.
2. Eileen McRae from DHFS announced that the Department is looking at revisions to Admin Rule HFS 107 related to MA transportation. **COMMENTS ON THE RULE NEED TO BE SENT TO EILEEN BY THE END OF SEPTEMBER.**
 - Bob Macaux and Liz Green agreed to put this on the agenda at the next ESPAC meeting on September 18th.

Issue	Proposal	Pros	Cons	Comments
1. Workload	Propose to eliminate prior authorization for transportation services	Reduces workload for agencies	Increase in appeals and shift of workload to state; Loss of ability to determine if client is taking the least expensive form of transportation (city bus vs. taxi)	OK to do 3 to 6 month approvals for a particular purpose e.g. pregnancy.
	JULY 9, 2003 MEETING: Proposal to specify that if the client is taking his/her own vehicle or a city bus, prior authorization is not needed. If the client wishes to take a taxi or form of transportation other than his/her own vehicle or city bus, prior authorization is needed. As always, the county needs to be able to document that the trip took place for an MA covered service	Reduces workload for agencies From 9/3/03: Bob Macaux reported that the general consensus at the ESPAC is that this recommendation will reduce workload. Dane County indicated that there would be a lesser reduction in workload for them because there is a lot of taxi cab usage in the county, but it does not increase it either.	Addresses the need to ensure that the client is taking the least expensive form of available transportation	<u>From 7/9/03 Meeting: The Workgroup agreed to forward this proposal to IMAC and DHFS management.</u> This may require an administrative rule change. 9/3/03 – Eileen McRae will research whether an admin rule change is necessary. In terms of documenting that a trip took place, there are various ways to do this. For example, some counties have a form the client takes to the provider for signature.

Issue	Proposal	Pros	Cons	Comments
2. Workload	Verify mileage through claims system	Reduces agency workload	a. Reimbursement delayed when claim is not submitted timely. This will increase calls and workload. If in managed care, we don't get those claims and again an increase in work for the state.	JULY 9, 2003 WORKGROUP MEETING: The Workgroup decided that the MA Handbook currently gives them the authority to deny claims for unreasonable mileage. This is not an issue that we need a recommendation on. Therefore, no recommendation will be forwarded to IMAC or DHFS managers on this item.

Issue	Proposal	Pros	Cons	Comments
3. Workload and adequacy of admin fee for counties.	Centralize the system – transportation broker option. So, authorization, verification and reimbursement would be provided centrally.	<p>a. Transportation for MA takes the burden off volunteer vans which are then freed up to serve other people/demands for rides.</p> <p>b. Reduces workload for local and state.</p> <p>c. Could decrease client confusion because they only have to call one number</p>	<p>a. Transportation for MA takes the burden off volunteer vans which are then freed up to serve other people/demands for rides. If taken from county, this control is taken away too.</p> <p>b. Concern that providers will no longer work cooperatively with the county</p> <p><u>From July 9, 2003 Meeting:</u> The biggest con is the fear that people will be lost in the shuffle if they are not working with someone locally.</p> <p><u>From 9/3/03 Meeting:</u> --How do you deal with a person who cannot wait for reimbursement (particularly in cases where an overnight stay may be required)? -- Another concern is that a centralized broker would not know about all the local resources available and the workload savings would be lessened.</p>	<p>Concern raised about family care counties. It is a risk-based system and transportation is part of the benefit package — providers at risk if they don't ensure it is provided. Also, need to be careful about what the authorization process might look like.</p> <p><u>FROM JULY 9, 2003 MEETING:</u> Prior Authorization is the biggest workload issue. The need for a centralized system is lessened if the prior authorization issue is addressed. However, agencies are open to looking at new ways of doing business. If a centralization proposal is considered by DHFS, the Workgroup would like to be involved in this effort. The workgroup identified the need to think about the impact on transportation providers getting reimbursed timely under a centralized system.</p> <p><u>From 9/3/03 Meeting:</u> The ESPAC met on July 17th and indicated that they would be willing to work on a proposal to centralize MA transportation.</p>

Issue	Proposal	Pros	Cons	Comments
4. Workload	SSI Recipients – budget proposal for HMO providers – include transportation in services	a. This would be a significant workload saving for local agencies.	Same as #3 above but smaller population. May be confusing for client in families where one person is on SSI and the other on MA	<p>Workgroup re: SSI in managed care provision in budget. This item can be discussed with the SSI workgroup</p> <p><u>From 9/3/03 Meeting:</u> Joanne Simpson agreed to follow up to find out when this issue might come up in the context of the larger proposal for HMO providers for SSI recipients. Joanne also agreed to clarify if the provision applies only to SSI recipients or all EBD Medicaid.</p>
5. Inconsistent Policy and Workload –	Statewide guidance on who is eligible for transportation services.	Everyone on MA is eligible for transportation with two exceptions. The exceptions are for Ambulance and SMV.		<p>DHFS will clarify in the next MA handbook</p> <p><u>From 9/3/03 Meeting:</u> DHFS asked if there were any outstanding issues on this topic. There was discussion and a question about whether a fee paid for an overnight stay at a Ronald McDonald House is reimbursable. The concern is that the charitable organization often calls this fee a “donation”. The Call Center has told agencies that this is not allowable. Eileen McRae is checking with the Department’s Legal Counsel. A clarification will be provided in an upcoming MA Handbook change.</p>

Issue	Proposal	Pros	Cons	Comments
6. Inconsistent Policy –	Issue on meal reimbursement. Attachment was provided prior to the July 9 th meeting, plus current handbook.			DHFS proposes either the State rate or County rate. The agency can choose and should adopt a written policy. <u>From 9/3/03 Meeting:</u> The committee reviewed the current MA Handbook language which states that the agency can pay ‘no greater than the amounts paid by the state to its employees for those expenses’. Agencies on the committee indicated they liked the flexibility. DHFS suggested that it is good business practice to put in writing what the agency’s rates are. The agencies indicated they would like more guidance on what points they have flexibility on. This will be discussed at a future meeting.
7. Inconsistent Policy.	Statewide guidelines needed to clarify who, what where why when how. Does 5 and 6 take care of these issues? See new MA release in MA handbook			May be beneficial to some counties but others may want more flexibility; Concern about what rules allow us to do. Smaller county concern.
8. Adequacy of Reimbursement fee for counties	DHFS has requested a small increase for common carrier administrative expenses			The Legislature has removed this provision

Other items/comments:

1. We should consider bringing in MA providers – what guidelines do they need and how do they view any of the options?
2. The number of providers did not seem to be a major issue. Bigger transportation issues centered on getting to work, or getting discharged from the hospital on a Sunday.
3. A separate issue has arisen. Do the local agencies feel they need guidelines on a deadline to submit mileage records? One county has a client that has recently submitted bills that are 2-3 years old. We would like to allow flexibility, but it might be good to have a specific timeframe.
4. We should e-mail the IM agency directors to announce the ad hoc committee to ensure we have adequate representation and to communicate that we want input as well as representation from local agencies. UPDATE – A REQUEST FOR INPUT WAS PUT FORTH IN ADMINISTRATOR'S MEMO ON IMAC.

From 9/3/03 Meeting:

Second Attendant Rules: There was a question about the admin rules related to second attendants. DHFS indicated that the state is considering modifying the current admin rule language. Agencies on the committee suggested that they would like to allow flexibility for an agency to make the determination regarding a second attendant. Larger counties, however, said this would be problematic as their workers cannot know their cases as well as workers in a smaller county might. **DHFS indicated that any recommendations on this should be forwarded to Eileen McRae by the end of September.**

SMVs: Eileen also indicated that they are looking specifically at rule changes related to Specialized Medical Vehicles.